

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, October 24, 2023

3:00pm – Microsoft Teams

Present: **Melinda Smith**, Chair; **Joseph DiVerdi**, Vice Chair; **Sue Doe**, Immediate Past Chair; **Jessica Watkinson** (substituting for Amy Barkley), interim Executive Assistant; **Jennifer Martin**, Agricultural Sciences; **Rob Mitchell**, Business; **Sybil Sharvelle**, Engineering; **Sharon Anderson**, Health and Human Sciences; **Antonio Pedros-Gascon**, Liberal Arts; **Christine Pawliuk**, Libraries; **William Sanford**, Natural Resources; **Michael Antolin**, Natural Sciences

Guests: **Brad Goetz**, Chair University Curriculum Committee; **Susan James**, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; **Richard Eykholt**, University Grievance Officer; **Jared Orsi**, History; **Tara Opsal**, Sociology

Absent: Katriana Popichak, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences (excused); Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant (excused); Zaid Abdo (substituting for Katriana Popichak), Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences; Andrew Norton, BOG Representative

October 24, 2023 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – October 17, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections or changes to be made to the Executive Committee minutes from October 17th.

Hearing none, minutes approved as submitted.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on October 31, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on November 7, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

Chair Smith: Reminder that we have another budget meeting this week, it's the Budget Model Open Forum and that is on Wednesday, October 25th, from 11:30a.m. to 12:30p.m., LSC 376-378. Encouraged folks to go to, don't know if there's going to be an online option for that.

Rob Mitchell: There's a Zoom link on the website, it will be recorded, and this is the primary one that'll be recorded.

B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Interim Provost Janice Nerger

Vice Provost Sue James: Did not attend the Committee on Teaching and Learning meeting yesterday, but Tom Siller, the Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, was there. There was some discussion about the selection process for UDTS, University Distinguished Teaching Scholars. If you look in the Manual, it does say that CoTL defines the selection process, and the UDTS had written Siller and I a while ago with some suggestions about some updates and changes. Siller and I have really wanted to open those nominations to all faculty because right now in the Manual it says you have to be tenured to apply for UDTS, and so the discussion at CoTL was very favorable yesterday. Siller reached out to Mike Palmquist today, who sent this proposal to the UDTS's to confirm that group agrees. If they confirm that, Siller was going to take back to CoTL and bring it, either to Executive Committee or to Faculty Governance to have a discussion at an upcoming Faculty Council meeting for a potential change to the Manual.

Vice Provost James: Noted that an email will be sent out soon to all faculty about our institutional membership for NCFDD, the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity. It's something we've had an institutional membership to for several years now, dating back to Dan Bush. Last, year it didn't get used as much, so we're trying to make people more aware of it and got the VPR to commit some funding for faculty to attend their boot camps in 2024.

Vice Provost James: Would also like to make a quick announcement at the November Faculty Council meeting about Interfolio, probably in the Provost's report. We're going to get communication out this week about that, and we've updated the web page. They'll finish migrating data from Digital Measures over at the end of December, so all 2023 data will get migrated over and so we just want to make people aware of it and drive them to the web page.

Chair Smith: Asked if Vice Provost James would like that as a placeholder in the announcements, or would rather put that with the Provost report.

Vice Provost James: Asked to put it in a placeholder because then it will be written on the agenda which will at least just get people's attention.

Chair Smith: Asked if there are any follow-ups to the 9 versus 12-month discussion.

Vice Provost James: Working on updating the new faculty annual review form. This is the form that has scores for Research, Teaching, Service, and Overall, and it has those 5 rankings. Have been working with the chairs and heads and everybody for quite a while now to update this. Will be meeting with HR and OGC about that sometime next week and will put the 9 versus 12-month follow up onto the agenda for that, too.

Vice Provost James: Other than that, I spoke with EVP Miranda today and he said he was hoping he'd know who the next VPR is by the end of the day today. So hopefully we'll get an announcement, maybe as soon as tomorrow. And then he thought that the person could start January 1.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Asked if we are updating the offer letters so that they can be clearer rather than just direct to external points, in follow up to the discussion about 9-month and 12-month appointments.

Vice Provost James: Will ask OGC and HR in this meeting coming up with them.

Michael Antolin: Expressed being strongly in favor of allowing CCAF to be University Distinguished Teaching Scholars. They do probably more than 50% of the overall instruction at the university, and I think their excellence and expertise should be recognized and rewarded.

Vice Provost James: Encouraged those who support this to speak up when this comes to Faculty Council. Hoping we'll have a receptive environment at Faculty Council about it.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – October 13, 2023

Brad Goetz: Move that we place the minutes of the University Curriculum Committee from October 13th on the Faculty Council agenda.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will appear on the Faculty Council agenda for November 7th as part of the consent agenda.

2. Proposed Revisions to Section K of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty – Jennifer Martin, Chair

Richard Eykholt: Provided background, that at the last Faculty Council meeting, there was a proposed change to Section K that got voted down. It appeared it got voted down because people didn't like the idea of removing the mediation, though there were also housekeeping changes in there. So we went through and took out everything about removing mediation and just left the

housekeeping changes and are sending those back for this upcoming meeting. Nothing is a change in policy, it's just cleaning up some things in the Manual that probably weren't as clear as they could have been.

Pedros-Gascon: Think the changes are pretty clear. Asked Eykholt if he could elaborate on section K.12.3, that is the one that the most wording is changed. It's probably a very logical thing, but I'm curious as to why we are taking off the department head from the discussion.

Eykholt: Answered that when it was decided to change the UGO from 25% time to 50% time, that money comes from the Provost Office, not from the from the department. We decided not to put that 25% or 50% in the Manual because if it varies in the future, we don't want to have to keep changing the Manual. So, we put wording into the procedures that was made parallel to the language for how the chair is compensated and the Board of Governors representative, and things like that. And that really took it out of the hands of the department chair because the department chair is not coming up with any money. How it's done is now in the Procedures Handbook, the department chair can't really override that, so that was the reasoning.

Pedros-Gascon: A concern about not having those percentages stated is the fact that what we may end up finding in the future, administration treating people differently from different departments. For example, if it's someone from my department, it might count as only 40% and not as 50% or things like that. So that for me is more part of a concern about how it should be articulated in a more equitable way, because otherwise we have a much more beneficial situation for some people than others.

Vice Provost James: So, we're actually trying to clean it up more. I see what you're saying, but having the chair involved hasn't led to consistency. So, what we've been working on is trying to get consistency and I don't know if there's something in the Procedures Handbook that helps with that.

Eykholt: Agreed. You'll notice in this old language the 25% wasn't in there either. It was always just negotiated. What's in the Procedures Handbook now has the 50%. It also has that parallel language, that is in there for the chair and everybody else about what the average pay is. The Procedures Handbook seemed like a more logical place to put it than the Manual, because that's where it is for everybody else.

Chair Smith: Agreed with Eykholt. The Procedures Handbook lays out the compensation and the time commitment of each of the officer's positions as well as the UGO, so agree it makes sense that this is providing that context and then you can go to the procedures to see how each one is individually negotiated.

Pedros-Gascon: Think that we should aim to standardize the positions in terms of the enormous distance that comes financially when a position is held by a person in sciences. Then when that same position is being held by a person in the humanities, we have to make sure that at least we are not bargaining down when it's people in the humanities who are being affected. Think that we should make sure for all of these positions, there is a minimum that should be met.

Eykholt: Noted that if you're comfortable with the way it's been done for the chair and the Board of Governors representative, etc., it was done the same way for the UGO.

Joseph DiVerdi: Wanted to make the comment that according to my read of the Procedures Handbook and recent discussions that we have had with Vice Provost James and the Provost Office, that the university faculty across the tenure track are treated identically. The way the language in there reads is the regular salary or the average among the cohort is what's used. So, the issue of STEM versus Fine Arts is addressed very nicely. That hasn't been done for the faculty off the tenure track, and that's still under discussion. We're making progress on these and am supportive of making the changes as proposed.

Sue Doe: Understands that this certainly became policy for officers on Faculty Council. However, as DiVerdi noted, there is a discrepancy that sounds like we haven't settled.

Vice Provost James: Clarified that the wording doesn't differentiate between tenure track or non-tenure track. It's agnostic to that, but right now the way the wording is, if you're non tenure track, you get compared to non-tenure track in the same rank, not all faculty in the same rank.

DiVerdi: That's correct but would hardly call that agnostic. The language doesn't speak to it, but the algorithm that's being used is what we were last discussing and hope to refine that.

Vice Provost James: Agreed.

Chair Smith: Move, on behalf of the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty, to place the revisions to Section K of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual on the agenda for the Faculty Council on November 7th.

Requested a vote.

Motion approved, will be placed on the Faculty Council Agenda for November 7th.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: Noted the draft strategic communication plan for Faculty Council and would like to hear the Executive Committee's feedback. The rationale behind this plan is to get the word out more about our role in shared governance and the impact of our work. To educate more broadly about shared governance to the broader university community, and to increase the trust in Faculty Council leadership and Faculty Council Executive Committee, and then also having ways to deal with issues that arise. We often deal with these on an ad hoc basis, but this plan will allow us to have a cadence of communication with the university community and with our stakeholders. What this plan lays out are strategies for doing that and some of the messaging that would go around it. This is the plan that I've been working on in collaboration with Amy Barkley and Pam Jackson.

Chair Smith: Some of the things that are on the list are setting up a form on the Faculty Council website to get feedback so if people want to reach out to Faculty Council they can, as well as directly to officers or other members. Think this would also be a way to help us keep track of these communications in one place. So that's the idea that hasn't gone online yet. It will soon and then I'll be working with Pam Jackson on trying to come up with a cadence calendar and thinking about how we can communicate on a regular basis, not only through SOURCE articles, but also through recurrent emails and things like that. Another part of the plan is to refresh the Faculty Council website, and this will likely happen in the spring because it's pretty clunky as it is. We can maybe revisit the website and come up with one that is a little more user friendly and in line with some of the refreshes that have gone on with a lot of other websites on the CSU website.

Chair Smith: Then we are going to work on a newsletter that we can send out monthly to communicate with the broader community and that will be a supplement to SOURCE articles as well. So, just a different way to deliver what we're doing and provide the impact that Faculty Council has.

Chair Smith: In the spring, the one thing I wanted to point out is this idea of Faculty Council coffees. These would run February through March and Joseph DiVerdi and I also talked about maybe having one in November if possible. Sue James has committed some funds to support that. We really appreciate that, and I think this will be a good way for us to connect with the broader university community and the Faculty Council members. The idea would be that we would open it up to faculty and maybe we'd bring in an administrator of the month, that would be there to also meet and greet with faculty and be able to answer questions that faculty members might have. The idea behind this is to not only be reaching out to the faculty, but also thinking about strategies and reaching up to the administration as well and communicating that way.

Doe: Asked to clarify the terms executive leadership in the first point because it says it's executive leadership, it clearly refers back to the Faculty Council, whereas in the third point it just says executive leadership, which I would initially take to mean the President's Cabinet.

Chair Smith: Agreed with Doe, that is a typo. It's still about positioning us as the leadership of Faculty Council and being a reliable resource for faculty to come to and to know that we're advocating for them to administration as well.

Doe: Noted, I was under some pressure as chair from some Deans to basically run the ideas that the Executive Committee were considering past the Deans before we would take it to our constituencies. Asked if this was a concession to that.

Chair Smith: No, not at all. The reason I approached Pam Jackson was that Sue James brought up the idea of coming up with the strategic communication plan.

Vice Provost James: Yes, it came up in the discussion around athletics and the fact that there is this perception of Faculty Council hating athletics or athletes or something which is not true. And that just got us thinking more broadly about strategic communication. But to Doe's point, one of the things that we talked about it is that we have to get our Faculty Council members doing a better job of cascading communication down because that's where the Dean should be hearing this from, is from their Faculty Council representatives.

Doe: Agreed and noted that and the Deans have full access to the agenda and to the minutes. So, it's always sort of interesting to me that somehow that's not sufficient, because there is nothing to prevent a Dean from participating in a Faculty Council meeting. In years past, they did, and sometimes quite meaningfully. But there was a growing perception that was articulated to me that they were being cut out. They get a copy and can be there, but it seemed like there was a desire to be able to vote basically. To be able to vote about whether things we should be entertaining ideas, and I was struck that that was a very different version of shared governance than I thought we were engaged in.

Chair Smith: Think this is a little ironic given the Faculty Council Chair no longer goes to the Council of Deans.

Doe: Which needs to be corrected in the Manual because if the Chair of Faculty Council only attends the Provost Leadership group and not the Council of Deans, that needs to be corrected because it's currently not accurate.

Vice Provost James: Noted that with the new Provost coming in, maybe we can go with the Manual the way it is.

Sharon Anderson: Asked to clarify how that happened where the Chair no longer goes to the Council of the Deans.

Doe: Explained that there was a perception that having all of those other people that are present at Council of Deans meetings, that the Deans couldn't speak freely to their Provost and therefore they needed to have a different meeting where people like the Chair of Faculty Council were not present. Where they could have those conversations, which really kind of undermines the entire effort of having representation in those in those meetings. They were basically bifurcated, there was the Provost Leadership group where everybody was invited, and this included a lot of folks, including, for instance, the Chair of the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning was often invited, but there was no longer a desire to have many such people in the room.

Chair Smith: Hope that with the new Provost, we can revisit these issues because it will otherwise require a Manual change. If indeed the Deans want that communication, I will tell you that at the last Provost Leadership Council meeting, I told them about what upcoming items were on the Faculty Council agenda and two of the Deans came back to me said they couldn't find the

agenda. Don't know what this disconnect is, but it's there, and wonder how we can get back to connecting with them more.

Doe: Noted that there was never anything adversarial, you know. There was just some sort of stuff that I think there were some of us they didn't want to in the room for. That's the only thing I could conclude because there was never a time when there was anything other than collegiality.

Chair Smith: Appreciative of Doe's comment. Understand where you're coming from because I've heard that same kind of messaging from the Deans as well.

Anderson: Asked if there was anything that needed to come from the Executive Committee members in order to support the Chair getting back into that space.

Pedros-Gascon: One of the things that we could consider is to bring it up in our first meeting with the incoming Provost. Would suggest making use of the first time that she comes to indicate to her that in the past that used to happen and that we would love to have that reinstated. Think that right now is not the moment in the sense that we just have an interim Provost.

Chair Smith: Agreed.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked for clarification on page 61 if it was referring to Amy Barkley or Amy Parsons.

Chair Smith: Confirmed it refers to Amy Barkley.

Pedros-Gascon: Noted that we should refer to Amy Parsons as President, just to make sure.

Chair Smith: Welcomed any additional feedback offline as well and the hope is to continue to finalize this this plan.

Mitchell: Commented that one thing that's worked well on this budget project is we also created an email address where multiple people have access to it. We've gotten feedback on that feedback form that has nothing to do with the budget model, partly because I think people just want a place where they can put feedback now. Think that might be a helpful approach as well. Then it could be the whole Executive Committee could have access to that email just to see what people are saying. There need to be some norms around it or, maybe a smaller group, but then there is some consistency when the Faculty Council Chair changes the history behind that doesn't go with the Chair because there's the email associated with it. For example, with our budget model email, Pam Jackson, Jennifer Martin, and I have access and we have some norms for how to respond. One is it enables faculty and staff to have a place where they can feel their voices being heard and get responses, et cetera. But two, it also then is transparency collectively as a group where everybody can kind of come in and see what's coming in and what people are thinking about and who's thinking about it. The other thing that's been helpful is making it so that

they can put their name or not put their name so that there could be anonymous feedback, but also named feedback that we can respond to.

Chair Smith: Yes, we discussed a Faculty Council email because of the issues that you've raised. The problem right now is that either Amy or I get emails or Joseph or Andrew or maybe even Executive Committee members get those emails, and for right now Amy's on maternity leave, and so we don't have access to some of the emails she's gotten in the past. We've discussed that and that's something we're going to implement because it will help with continuity and it helps with transparency and being able to communicate what's going on.

Chair Smith: The next thing I want to share with you all is a draft of a newsletter and I would love feedback on that. So, there will be more coming as far as the ways in which we can start implementing this communication plan. Appreciate your support and feel that this is a way to continue to have us front and center and continue to communicate what we do in different ways because as we know a lot of people don't read the SOURCE stories. So that can't be the only way we communicate and only putting out our web page as well is not as effective either and what shocks me is how little many of the Deans pay attention to what happens and how many faculty aren't aware of what we do. I will be attending the Cabinet meeting tomorrow as well as the Provost Leadership Council, and so will have some updates from those next week.

~~2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton~~

3. Budget Model Report – Jennifer Martin, Rob Mitchell

Mitchell: We have a number of different sessions coming up. What we don't want to have happen is we have all these sessions scheduled and planned and nobody shows up. We have tried to advertise it in lots of ways, but we want people to show up. We want them to be engaged and so there's kind of three types of meetings that we have. Tomorrow is the Open Forum and there will be some food provided. We also want to get people to come to these coffee chats that we'll be doing. So, we'll see if that's possible, but making sure that people come to the one on Friday at 7:30am it's so that facilities folks can come when staff changeover happens. But the question is whether they know about it, and so making sure that we're really advertising and communicating on the channels that we have available and letting people know where to find these. Then the last one is the Lunch and Listen sessions, and we have five of those. We've tried to do one every day of the week so that there's one that hopefully everybody can attend, but again, that really requires information to be put out. We have a SOURCE story, the website, and emails, but I think some people may not pick up on any of those. And so if we could get your help to share this information that would be great.

Mitchell: The other only kind of point to note is the executive committee will be charged on Thursday. That's when we were able to get time that everybody could attend that, and the process can continue to move forward from there. But right now, what we'd love is for people to go to the website, read what we have, attend the forum, come to the chats, provide feedback, learn about the process, and be able to answer some questions around this process for CSU.

Chair Smith: Asked to clarify that this refers to the budget model executive committee.

Mitchell: Yes, it is the budget model executive committee which will be charged on Thursday.

Antolin: Asked how that executive committee is identified, recruited, nominated, etc.

Mitchell: President Parsons selected that committee. President Parsons, Chair Smith, EVP Miranda, CFO and VP of Operations Brendan Hanlon, and the Provost are on the executive committee, and then that committee will charge the next committees. The next two committees are the steering committee and the technical committee and with those, we've followed best practices of what other universities have done and leaned into shared governance. With that, we've got the CPC chair, the APC Chair, the CoNTTF chair, the CoSFP chair, the chair of the Council of Chairs, so it's a number of folks around our shared governance. All the Deans are on that committee. Jennifer Martin and I have meetings with all the Deans to help them understand the process and make sure that they are aware of what's going on. Think we're still waiting for one or two to get finalized. The technical committee has all the budget officers. And Brendan Hanlon serves on the executive committee and then he's chairing the steering committee while Angie Nielsen is serving on the steering committee and chairing the technical committee. Martin and I aren't officially on any committee but were advisors on all the committees to make sure that there's some shared learning and communication across to make the process efficient.

Mitchell: There is also a nomination process for other folks to be on the committee whether it's department chairs or other faculty members. One of the things that was noted is that you don't want these committees to be overly large. That if the committee's too large it impedes the process, and the added voices aren't necessarily providing the necessary benefit relative to the size. One of the things that David Attis noted is that the critical people on the committee are the Deans. So, this is something that we really push for is to ensure all the Deans voices and the budget officer voices are there so that the different college perspectives can be represented. That's what we know about the committees, but it's really that executive committee for the budget model that charges those and decides on those.

Antolin: One of the questions that came up from faculty was if there would be a mechanism for constructive feedback from faculty. Noted how that just didn't seem to be a part of our last topic planning exercise very much and that there are certain people that wanted to be listened to and the rest of us were left to say, whatever we come up with, you're just going to have to be happy with. So, I'm just curious how much attention is being paid to that.

Mitchell: Think there are a number of mechanisms. People are already using the feedback form and providing feedback and asking questions. Think the feedback form and these sessions that we're having are probably the best way to do that. That's the reason we're having 20-some odd sessions. We're trying to educate as to what this is, why we're doing this, that this isn't new, that this is not something that's at the cutting edge of higher education management, that these models have existed, that there's nothing decided on right now, so there is no budget model yet. But what we know is where the incremental is, where the RCM full model is, and it's likely we'll end up somewhere in the middle. But what that looks like is dependent upon the kind of feedback that we get, to create something that can help renew the direction of the university and where it's going.

Pedros-Gascon: Has heard similar concerns and a very strong concern is the idea of the hybrid and in the sense that at least with the other one, you have a very clear understanding of what is

entering and what is exiting. But the very idea of how things may be maneuvered or may be negotiated makes many people very concerned. There are concerns about how things may be used. So, the lack of clear expectations is a concern.

Mitchell: Asked to clarify what is meant by expectations.

Pedros-Gascon: There is a concern that if numbers have a strong impact on some people, they may be revised. The possibility of some favoritism or lack of that is a concern. I'm just transmitting a concern, but the reality is that there is a very strong concern about the hybrid nature because when we introduce hybrid, and we are not clearly making a set of understandings of what that hybrid means, that starts making a lot of people very nervous.

Mitchell: Suggested putting that in the feedback, that would be very helpful, and we'll make sure that it gets to that steering committee. As a point of clarification, some universities have tried the full RCM model and have walked it back to a more hybrid model. There are also some real challenges to the incremental model. When we say hybrid, it means that somewhere in between that is where we'd likely land. That work of the steering committee and the technical committee that feeds up to that executive committee will land such that once there's a model that's decided upon it won't be ambiguous and it will be very clear that there will be transparency. That's one of the reasons that I like this potential approach is because of the transparency that can emerge from it. There are some decisions that need to be made this fall somewhere between that continuum and where that lies really depends on the kind of feedback that we get and the work that those committees do such that once we get to a defined model that it's not ambiguous and it is a hybrid in the sense that it is somewhere on the continuum. But it's not unclear in terms of what's happening and that there actually are very clear expectations and processes in place that everybody understands.

Pedros-Gascon: Maybe one way of articulating the concept of hybrid could be to indicate that you are using those RCM updated models as the base. The problem with hybrid, at least for some people who are either very cynical or have been for too many years, is concern about the possibility of making very arbitrary decisions.

Mitchell: What we've really tried to convey is that nothing has been decided with the hybrid model. The process is open and there will be lots of opportunity for feedback and we want transparency so that people understand where this is coming from. Right now, we have the listening sessions. Once we get closer to rolling something out the same set of processes will apply where there's lots of listening, sessions, explanations, clarification.

Anderson: Asked to clarify how we know nothing has been decided yet.

Mitchell: Suggested that nothing has been decided in terms of where we fall on the hybrid model. President Parsons will be the one to decide. Encouraged everyone to not disengage from the process because they think that something is decided. There are a lot of possibilities regarding what a budget model looks like. It is possible there are other conversations we are not party to.

Mitchell: Asked Chair Smith, who sits in on a lot of these meetings with the Cabinet and the Provost Leadership Council, if anything has been heard around something being decided or some set plan where we know exactly what the redesign process would look like.

Chair Smith: Think it's pretty clear that a hybrid model has been decided on, it's just not clear what that hybrid model will be.

Mitchell: And so, within that space, there's a lot of room to maneuver.

Doe: Asked if Mitchell or Martin could explain how they position themselves as critical observers or participants in these processes because it's so important as a member of the Executive Committee and representing the faculty for us to have a strong critical lens on what is being proposed. Curious about how you've added your voice where you felt that there might be ways in which you there are heading down a path that contain some concerns.

Mitchell: So, if I understand correctly, we've been trying to engage in a way that really makes sure that faculty voice has been heard.

Doe: Believe that we are being heard, but not sure they have a willingness to act upon feedback that we're giving and that was always my frustration. Asked what some of the critical points have been, and where the tension is.

Mitchell: In some of the initial conversations, for instance, there was discussion around having a Dean or a couple of Deans and some budget officers represent their perspectives, and one of the things that Martin and I have really felt strongly about is that every Dean at every college should be represented on this committee. So that all college voices are represented, and every budget officer should be represented on the committee, and then we should have some breadth of roles across different positions, etc. That's one area where we've really leaned into strongly.

Mitchell: Additionally, ensuring that that our shared governance mechanisms are represented across the committee. For instance, we've got our student cost representatives, and we've suggested that they be on the committees so that we have student voices. We have CoNTTF, CPC, APC, a number of members of the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning, Chair Smith on the Executive Committee. Think those are some areas where our voice has been heard and we've been listened to assuming that the that the executive committee goes with some of the recommendations that we've made, that shared governance piece becomes a very big part of this process.

Jennifer Martin: Agreed with Mitchell. Don't feel that we haven't been listened to in every space where there is a decision to be made relative to communications structure, shared governance, and things of that nature. Feel that our perspective of representing the faculty and trying to make sure that the faculty's best interests are top of mind in this process has been heard and listened to, acknowledged, and acted upon. Think there's no reason to believe that that won't continue as we get into the nitty gritty of working with the various committees. We've been invited to push back and question. So I do feel this process has allowed us that opportunity perhaps more so than it might seem from the outside. Think we'll continue to see that moving forward.

Chair Smith: Suggested saving some time in next week's meeting for further discussion.

F. Discussion Items

1. Discussion about Clark Revitalization – Jared Orsi, Tara Opsal

Jared Orsi: Thanked the Executive Committee for being willing to hear us, and I'm here with Tara Opsal.

Tara Opsal: I'm an Associate Professor and the incoming chair for the Department of Sociology.

Orsi: And I'm a Professor in the History department and the Director of the Public and Environmental History Center. Not able to be with us today, but very active in discussing our concerns and planning for our presentation is Mary Van Buren from the Anthropology and Geography department. Together the three of us represent the three departments that will be most affected by the Clark Revitalization Project and the transition of faculty and students and classrooms out of the portion of the of the building that is to be revitalized. We would like to ask Faculty Council to help us elevate the Clark transition space issue to the attention of the central administration in hopes that the central administration can contribute both financial resources and some assistance with finding space to make this transition proceed with the least cost and greatest positive impact on CSU students, staff, and faculty.

Orsi: There are three things that Opsal and I would like to emphasize here. One is to make visible what the process is right now and what's going on. Secondly, to let you know about some concerns that our departments' faculty and staff have raised. Finally, to inquire about what might be done to harness university wide support for making this transition work as well as it possibly can.

Orsi: Gave background on what's going on. Would like to frame this as not just a department or CLA issue, but the Clark building. Every semester, the vast majority of students at CSU have at least one class in the Clark building. There are over 150 faculty and staff who are going to be moved out of that building during this revitalization process for quite a long time, 3.5 years at least and if we factor in the likely construction delays and things like that, it may be longer.

Orsi: The situation is that the funding for the Clark revitalization was initially going to be a much larger a scale project and we learned this summer that it's going to be constricted. So, there's going to be some renovation to the Clark A building, the north part of the building and C is going to have very little renovation to it and that will be saved for another day. That is a whole other issue for the departments that are in that building that's not getting any renovation. Then the B wing, which is the bridge between the north and the south, is going to be demolished starting next semester, and then it will be rebuilt as a much larger and taller building in between. The college has been communicating with us over the last several months on this process.

Orsi: In September, we received a communication asking faculty through a poll what kind of options they saw as feasible and preferable for this 3.5 year plus displacement. All of them were a little bit alarming in one way or another to say the least. It's not to say that they can't work, but with the information provided, there were a lot of questions that came up.

Orsi: Off campus space, working from home, and non-permanent space, what's called hoteling, where you can go to a desk, but it's not your desk. These were all presented to us and then a couple weeks later we heard from the Dean, and I believe the current schedule is that some faculty will be moved out of offices and portions of the B Wing will cease to be functional as early as December and that some faculty would move out over winter break. Some would move out over the course of the spring, and everybody would be out of the building by May 2024. That communication assured us that nobody would be moved until there was a destination for them which was reassuring.

Orsi: So, that's kind of the situation that we are in, and we don't have a lot of details and specifics. I don't know if necessarily the people who are planning the move know exactly yet either. So, I don't think it's being withheld from us per se, but there isn't a lot of final information on this. Opsal was one of the contributors to a letter that the Sociology department wrote about the situation. Asked if Opsal wanted to add anything from that letter.

Opsal: At the end of August, Dean Withers and the Council of Chairs met with us and basically said that come December or May, depending on when we move out, faculty and staff, or between 160 and 180 people that are housed in Clark would either be working virtually for 3.5 years or would be sharing space in a scattered way around campus. So, I just want to amplify that while the survey presented a lot of choices, what has been framed to us from the beginning and what the Dean's office has been working with is no specific information about what might be available to faculty and staff who are housed in Clark. So that was the information that we were really working with and that we can continue to work with as departments.

Opsal: In response, our department, Sociology, were very concerned when we heard this for a number of reasons. We want to share some of those concerns with you and it's what our letter focused on that we wrote together as an executive committee and our department that we sent to Brendan Hanlon and Rick Miranda. That was our first audience.

Orsi: Provided information building on what was just said about the current conditions. Yesterday, I received two communications from the Dean's office, either to me personally or to a small group of people. The Dean's office has convened a working group for a consult of faculty and staff at Clark A to talk about the move process. The other one, because I'm a center director, I got a personal communication about what would happen to the center. Just in the last couple days, it seems like some things are moving and there is ongoing communication, and it seems like something may be imminent in terms of getting some more specifics.

Orsi: I've heard quite a few concerns in my department as well, and I've talked to Mary Van Buren extensively about Anthropology and Geography.

Opsal: My understanding after talking with the Dean and Ryan Claycomb, who's in charge of space and planning in our college, is that the meeting that resulted from our letter between folks on campus who are making decisions about space including EVP Miranda, is that there appears to be some university commitment that's very ambiguous.

Opsal: My understanding is that's not actually trying to make space that exists around campus visible but instead is about thinking through what it would mean in terms of a budget of bringing in temporary structures to house our displaced staff and faculty and departments. So, my understanding is that there are just initial conversations happening around this as a possibility.

Opsal: In terms of concerns in our department, we talked to graduate students, undergraduate students, faculty, and staff and all our issues and concerns are related to equity and access. We conducted a survey and our department. In Sociology, we have over 600 majors and an additional 200 minors. So, we're educating, including our graduate students, nearly 900 students and by displacing faculty and asking them to work virtually from home for 3 1/2 years or work in scattered, shared flex spaces around campus, we have a lot of concerns about student access to faculty and staff.

Opsal: We educate a disproportionately high number of racially minoritized students, Pell Grant students, and 1st Gen students, and we already know that there is a lot of access issues to faculty and university resources for those groups of students in particular. As for most CLA departments and of course with Covid, we learned that displacement is an issue tied to race, class, and gender. We're worried about our faculty who don't have space at home to work and in Fort Collins, as we know, housing makes that extra space nearly impossible to find, especially for our new faculty. This displacement will have a disproportionate effect on those folks who don't have those spaces at home to work, which includes our PhD and master students, who are often already living in untenable spaces around campus. And these are folks who are also educating our students as TAs and graduate instructors.

Opsal: We have an undergraduate student representative on our department council and she's brought concerns to us after she's talked with her cohort of peers. Just how this make the students feel that they're already homed in a building that the university isn't prioritizing and hasn't prioritized historically, and that now they're saying that they can't access their faculty because they're going to be scattered around campus. So, our student has expressed concerns about feeling extra devalued as a College of Liberal Arts student.

Opsal: As the final issue that a lot of my colleagues identify is what it would mean for our department to have to work from a place of being very scattered, whether that means working virtually from home or scattered around campus and not being together. We're a really

collaborative, collegial department and Covid like most, experienced really serious harms to our academic community during COVID. We're really worried that being displaced in an unorganized way will mean that we'll just be focused on maintaining the building blocks of our community as opposed to being able to advance programming, advance curriculum, and do things on behalf of the university such as bring guest speakers. We're worried it will really set our department back, whereas other departments will be able to function as business as usual.

Opsal: So those are some of the central concerns that students and staff and faculty raise that I've heard.

Orsi: Agreed with Opsal. I've heard versions of that throughout my department as well. I would underscore the issue of access and equity. I think we and our department have made a big push to try and make the department a physically and socially welcoming space, particularly to reach out to students who are first generation or people of color or disabled who might find the university a difficult place to navigate physically as well as socially, and the dispersal is of real concern.

Antolin: Noted similar experience with getting this biology building built and some of the displacement that happened at that time. We weren't displaced for that amount of time, but there was some teaching space that was closed. I don't know where your program budget is, but at the time, Tony Frank turned down any possibility of using any kind of temporary space on campus and said he doesn't want to look like a trailer park, is kind of what he said.

Antolin: Asked if the possibility of placing some kind of temporary housing somewhere where you may not be exactly where you want to be but are still together on campus with access to small classrooms and conference rooms and offices and all those things has been discussed.

Opsal: When I first brought this up to the Dean's office, the response was that this is against rules that we have on our campus. That there are rules written somewhere that we can't put up temporary structures. I was surprised, and I know Ryan was surprised in the Dean's office as well, that the first solution was to maybe create some temporary space around campus. That's why I'm feeling very uncertain about the possibility of that being a viable solution.

Chair Smith: Noted that construction companies put up temporary buildings, so don't think that could be correct.

Antolin: Think you need to question whether that's a real rule or whether it's just one of these attitudes that has existed in some folks about what the curb appeal of the campus is.

Pedros-Gascon: Think if there is willingness, that can be done but there needs to be some money. I want to show my solidarity with my fellow CLAs. Also want to support the idea that we need to have upper administration engaging financially in this situation. We cannot end up with this situation. We are going to start working with the building that is already in good condition, Clark A, that is the one that was reworked more recently. Then we are going to Clark B which, by the way, when we were talking about how it would look, the idea was a very open space. We still have Clark C with asbestos and everything that is going to remain the same place. I want to highlight the very situation that, basically, 100% of all the students of this institution take at least one course in Clark, and that gender, equity, access, and all those things are something that are being highly depressed and impacted, and that we have some of the poorest paid departments in that building and that we are now being told there is not even money to try to have you all moving to a better home.

Pedros-Gascon: Think this institution needs to start taking this a little more seriously. We cannot end up with a situation in which we are spending an incredible amount of money on some buildings, but we are absolutely unwilling to spend an equitable amount of money for buildings that have a primary educational function. We should be spending money on that and that may mean that we have to reprioritize some stuff. Want to make it clear these colleagues that are here are not alone, it's a very strong concern in the college for basically every single department.

Martin: Speaking from experience, our department, during the construction of our new building, did use temporary buildings at Foothills Campus. Can't speak to how they were paid for or where they came from specifically, but it did happen, and they were used. So, I think that's something I would encourage you to ask more questions about.

Orsi: There's been considerable concern in my department about temporary buildings and being very far from the central area of campus in general. We have a number of bicycle commuters that, if they had to travel several miles over the course of the day, it would be difficult on them. We also have some disabled faculty who don't drive and bussing them around may or may not be feasible. We're also concerned about how we would interact with students. We can barely get into our office hours now, so that's something to think about with off campus locations and temporary or permanent buildings. We're also concerned about how with off campus space, the burdens of it fall disproportionately on some of the people least able to handle it, both students and faculties.

Chair Smith: It sounds like up until recently there has been little resolution from your dean, and potentially chairs as well, but particularly from the college as to what the way forward is, is that correct?

Opsal: I would echo Pedros-Gascon and say that my experience has been that our dean has tried to move this conversation up to university leadership and that it hasn't been received. And so, in part, one of the things that I would be hopeful that Executive Committee and Faculty Council could help us with is moving this beyond the conversation of the CLA and moving this towards

where we're asking university leadership to address some of these more systemic issues that create broader forms of inequality across the university, especially in relationship to space.

Opsal: Space is handled in a really politicized, strange way on this campus because it's very siloed. What we're seeing right now is that there's not a lot of political will being exercised by the university leadership who are starting to enter this conversation. My hope is that we can kind of elevate this conversation outside of the CLA and help empower our dean to have some mobility around this issue.

Chair Smith: It sounds like the Dean is advocating, but ineffectively or not making headway. Certainly, the position of Faculty Council is in support faculty, and if this is happening, he's not getting any traction. We're here to help, that's my opinion. I won't speak for the rest of the Executive Committee, but how we can advocate for you or give you a voice in a broader context, I'm all for that. We can discuss that as a committee and see what others would like to do, but I think that that's the next step. It sounds like at least providing a broader platform for you to voice your concerns and to advocate for something happening.

Orsi: Think what we most want here is to complement the efforts that the Dean is already making, not to substitute or go around and get higher authority, but rather to open a new channel of bringing this to the attention of the central administration and reframing it as not a department or college concern, but rather this is a campus of campus wide concern. That we have a smooth transition process, and we fully understand this is going to be inconvenient for everybody. We don't think this is going to be without problems, but to open a new channel to bring it to the essential administration's attention, we'd very much appreciate that.

DiVerdi: I'll second what Chair Smith said that I'm also in support of your circumstances, and we'll try to keep getting as many people as possible supportive. Asked if you have in mind a desired state and if you've figured out what would be the adequate circumstance as you're going forward.

Orsi: Again, there's 160 or 180 different faculty who are affected by this, so it's hard to say. I think for the History department at least, the two principles that seem to be most important are finding ways to maintain community and access for students and to maintain a departmental identity, and part of that is space. Part of it could be money, like trying to figure out how we spend money to have social gatherings that involve students and faculty on a large scale. So, maintaining physical space that promotes community is welcoming to students and attracts them. Then the second one is having a permanent location that's on campus and central to other campus spaces and activities. So that again, thinking about our non-driving faculty members, the need to use computer scanners, printers, books without having to carry 40-pound backpacks all over campus and to and from different locations and things like that. So, community and permanent and private or semi-private spaces.

Opsal: We conducted a survey of our faculty staff and graduate students, so I have specific data on logistical, tangible needs, including how faculty and students rank different arrangements. As an example, the most desired outcome among everybody is on campus office space that is private, and then second, an off-campus office that is private, and then an on or off campus office that is shared with one other. So, what I'm trying to amplify there is that privacy or a shared office space with one other person are sort of the top choices, whereas flex spaces or drop in spaces and reservable spaces where there's no privacy and where you can't lock your door or keep your research materials and grading materials, etc., those are things that that folks really do not want. We also have data on how many hours different people are working in their offices. So, where it would make sense to put people together, whereas other people are in there all the time and so a shared office space would be very complex in terms of getting work done.

DiVerdi: Asked if these visions have been articulated to the authorities and how it was received.

Opsal: I have had multiple conversations with Ryan and Dean Withers. My experience is that they're listening, but they do not have access to the resources to push the conversation along that's aligned with the goals that we have as departments and affected staff and faculty and the B wing. Our letter that went off to EVP Miranda, I heard he was traveling internationally when that went out, and he responded within 48 hours. I've gotten another update from him that they're working on it, but that's all I've gotten, and that letter went to him over a month ago.

DiVerdi: The clock is ticking, if you're going to start moving people out in December.

Chair Smith: Think the next move forward, if Executive Committee is in favor of this, is to have this is a discussion item on the Faculty Council agenda in on November 7th. Asked if Executive Committee members were in favor of that.

DiVerdi: Yes.

Antolin: Think if this is going to be on the Faculty Council agenda, then we need some kind of document or something to present to the rest of the Council, because just a discussion like this will not, I think, produce much for us. Asked if Opsal and Orsi could provide some short prospectus that shows the problem.

Chair Smith: Agreed, it has to have either some kind of presentation or a document ahead of time to provide context for Faculty Council. This action of putting you on the agenda is to provide visibility about this and get the word out about it, but also having context so that the time slot you would have for the agenda would be primarily dedicated to asking for support for CLA and the need for facilities available to you that that meet your needs. And that the problem is that you're not getting that commitment yet. Think that's the way to frame it and bring it to the Faculty Council. President Parsons will be at that meeting, and so that is something that if we

have it early enough on the agenda, we can ask her if she can stay and listen. So, I think that could be an effective way to get to the dire, impending situation that's coming up for you.

Pedros-Gascon: Would propose to some extent, rather than next month, to have it in December. The reason being that we already are going to have a presentation from Athletics, the President, and the Provost. We have several reports going on, so I don't know if maybe it would make a little more sense to move it to December as a as an item for discussion and it that might allow to have some of some more movement of the of the situation and have a more clear, clearly tailored discussion.

Antolin: It strikes me that times of the essence here if things are going to start happening in December. I think we need to move this forward quickly if there's going to be a possibility of relief.

Chair Smith: We could ask Joe Parker to go in in December as well. I think he might be willing to be flexible with that. We could check with him and given that that's not a pressing issue, it's really about information from him. Agree with Antolin, think this is something that seems like an urgent matter.

Antolin: If they're starting to think about moving you in December, that means that ship may have actually sailed, because it does mean budget and that kind of stuff.

Chair Smith: Will get back with Opsal and Orsi and will talk to Joe Parker and see if he'd be willing to move to December so that we can make room and have enough space for you to be able to talk and I can get back to you soon before next week.

Opsal: Whether you decide it's in November or December, us being able to say that we've been invited to present at Faculty Council, and so please give us the most updated information that you have about where this is that in and of itself places great pressure and require some specificity. So, from my perspective being able to send that specific message to leadership is compelling.

Orsi: I'm on board with this and would be happy to put together some documentation and whatever else is needed to make this happen.

2. Update on Campus Safety – Ryan Brooks

Ryan Brooks: Jennifer Martin and I have been talking and had other faculty that were posing conversations after the incident and shooting at UNC and other things that happen around the country and what that looks like if something ever happened on CSU campus, whether it's just a

lockdown or something else. Questions were posed by other faculty and even students for that matter, and we came to the fact that we probably don't have great communication or a plan in place of how we react. There were questions about do you continue teaching, how do you lock doors in classrooms, what does all that look like, etc. We don't communicate that well across the campus. There were other conversations on Faculty Council in the past about doing things like active shooter training. I think another kind of big push was just this idea of communication from the university to faculty and staff. In this kind of arena, Faculty Council and addressing faculty and how we are trained and how we handle these situations and making sure people are well prepared if something was to happen, I think can be quite chaotic across campus in terms of just how we respond in different instances in buildings.

Brooks: So, I met with Marc Barker, the Associate Vice President for Safety and Risk Services, and he was fully transparent that prior to him there hasn't been much of the conversation around this. There's Emergency Management plans at the university that you can find, but those really focus on the response of the Police Department and infrastructure behind the scenes, but we don't do a good job in communication across the university, training the faculty, etc. So, he mentioned that they were working with Kyle Henley the VP of MarComm to try to push more of a comprehensive plan across the university. They do things like training for activist assailants, but he said the number of faculty that take things like that are miniscule, and so some universities require something like that with onboarding. I think he was receptive to this idea that we need to do a better job of training faculty and just communicating with faculty on what that looks like and answering many of those concerns. The reality is, frankly, our students are probably more prepared and have these conversations more than we do, just in the era that they've grown up in. I think there's questions and concern around campus and we want to make sure that we address that.

Brooks: Barker mentioned that he was happy to come to a Faculty Council meeting if that was of interest to provide an update on their current initiatives from his office. Maybe we can better address some of those faculty questions that exist across campus and what that communication plan looks like. As he said, they sometimes have things happen in the silo of their office of risk and safety management, but not conversations with faculty. He also extended an invitation for anybody on Executive Committee to attend the regular public safety meetings. If somebody would like to, he's happy to send them invites.

Chair Smith: Mentioned attending the Physical Development meeting on Friday, and during that meeting talked about bringing information to Faculty Council about how they're going to start putting in a new design consideration of opaque class and things like that. Which is troubling with active shooter kind of situations, but the other thing that they were going to do is share with us how many buildings and the proctors of those buildings are.

Chair Smith: The owners of those buildings have the ability to make their own safety plans and try to bring that awareness up. So, there is some momentum from different parts of the university of around safety. Think maybe that could be something we could bring both Barker and maybe this other perspective from the physical development side of things and have an informational

session on campus safety.

Chair Smith: Propose that myself, Brooks, and Martin set up a time to meet and talk about a strategy to bring a discussion item to Faculty Council in the future.

3. Discussion about Academic Calendar Fall 2028-Summer 2030 – Joseph DiVerdi

DiVerdi: We're beginning to work on the academic calendar for 2030. There's a process that we go through each year in the university and that is setting the academic calendar. It is a Faculty Council task and generally it is executed by the vice chair. The calendar needs to be walked through, and all the dates for a number of key events have to be laid into place. We have to make sure that there's a certain number of course hours and days taking place. Once that is drafted, the faculty need to approve that through Faculty Council. The last step is for the Board of Governors to approve that through their own meetings, which is generally done without comment. We're working at this time with the Registrar's Office on these calendars. These have to be done a number of years ahead of time.

DiVerdi: Holidays like Thanksgiving, Labor Day, MLK Jr. Day are fixed legislatively, but others float and so that changes the calendar from year to year. Here's an example of Fall 2028, which begins on August 21. I will not walk through all the details, but you can see in the right-hand column the various events that are scheduled. This is a list that the Registrar's Office has put together about the rules for making a calendar, and there are some various rules about them. There's rules for the spring, rules for the summer, and rules for the fall. They need to follow some strictures that have a lot of different origins. The plan at this point is for me to present this to Faculty Council Executive Committee next week, for a vote to bring them to Faculty Council in November for approval.

G. Executive Session – Presidential Evaluation Survey

Executive Session tabled for next week's meeting.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Melinda Smith, Chair
Joseph DiVerdi, Vice Chair
Andrew Norton, BOG Representative
Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant

